92-1724

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 11 1993
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

NO._____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED
STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1992

Emilia DiNola

Petitioner

v

Robert James Stewart, et als,

Respondents

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF

APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Emilia DiNola, Pro Se

302 Westmoreland Drive

Trenton, New Jersey, 08618

(609) 882 - 1961

QUESTIONS TO BE PRESENTED, THAT WERE NOT GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT:

ROBERT JAMES STEWART

1.HOME ADDRESS.

2. DO YOU WORK? WHERE?

3. ARE YOU IN BUSINESS FOR YOURSELF?

4. WHAT DO YOU DO? WHERE?

5. DID YOU SERVE IN THE MILITARY?

6.IF SO, BRANCH? UNIT?

7.ARE YOU ACTIVE IN THE MILITARY?

IF SO, WHERE?

8. DO YOU RECEIVE PLEASURE IN MESMERIZING AND TORTURING PEOPLE?

9. WHY DID YOU TORTURE MY MOTHER AND MY FAMILY?

10. WHAT RIGHT DO YOU HAVE TO DESTROY AND INVADE OUR ANATOMIES AND INTRUDE UPON OUR LIVES?

11. ARE ANY OF YOUR CHILDREN MARRIED?

/

KEVIN MATER

1. HOME ADDRESS

2.DO YOU WORK? IF SO WHERE?

3. DID YOU SERVE IN THE MILITARY?

4. IF SO, BRANCH? UNIT?

5. ARE YOU ACTIVE IN THE MILITARY?

6.IF SO, BRANCH? UNIT?

7. HOW DID YOU BECOME INVOLVED WITH ROBERT JAMES STEWART TO TORTURE MY FAMILY AND ME?

8. WHY? DO YOU ENJOY DESTROYING PEOPLE WHO DO NOTHING TO YOU?

DORIS PAUL

1. WHY DID YOU BECOME INVOLVED WITH ROBERT JAMES STEWART AND HIS CRUEL ACTIVITIES?
2. WHERE YOU THREATENED BY HIM?
3. IF SO, WHY DIDN'T YOU REPORT HIM?
4. DO YOU ENJOY HARASSING INNOCENT PEOPLE?
5. YOUR MOTHER TOLD ME IN 1978 YOU CALLED ROBERT JAMES STEWART, EVERY NIGHT AT 6:00 O'CLOCK AND GAVE HIM ALL THE PERSONAL INFORMATION YOU RECEIVED ABOUT THE VICTIM.
WHY?

ISOBELLE STEWART JOHNSON

1. DO YOU AND YOUR FAMILY ENJOY HARASSING AND SPYING ON PEOPLE?

2. WHAT BENEFIT DO YOU RECEIVE IN AIDING ROBERT JAMES STEWART IN TORTURING PEOPLE?

3. HAVE YOU BEEN THREATENED BY HIM? IF SO, WHY DIDN'T YOU STOP HIM OR REPORT HIM?

4. WHAT BENEFIT DO YOU RECEIVE IN TORTURING PEOPLE?

WOMANSPACE - REGINA PODHORIN - MELISSA MC CULLOUGH

1. DID YOU REPORT THIS MATTER TO THE POLICE?
2. IF SO, WHY?
3. WHY DIDN'T YOU KEEP OUR AGREEMENT?
4. WHY DID YOU NOTIFY HELENE FULD CRISIS?
5. IS THIS A PRACTICE OF WOMANSPACE, PUTTING PEOPLE IN CONFINEMENT?

DR. GOERING

1. ARE YOU INVOLVED IN ANY SPECIAL PROGRAM OR RESEARCH TEAM?

2. IF SO, WHO ? WHERE?

3. WHAT BENEFIT DO YOU RECEIVE IN HELPING TO TORTURE PEOPLE?

4. WHY DIDN'T YOU RENEW YOUR LICENSE? TO PRACTICE PSYCHIATRY?

THEY WERE UP IN JUNE, 1979, ACCORDING TO THE N.J. MEDICAL BOARD OF EXAMINERS.

DR. DAVID SNYDER

1. ARE YOU AFFILIATED WITH ANY RESEARCH TEAM OR PROGRAM?
2. IF SO, WHO? WHERE?
3. ARE YOU AWARE OF THE FACT THAT HAMPTON IS A FICTICIOUS NAME?
4. DO YOU RECEIVE ANY SPECIAL COMPENSATION FOR WORKING IN A HOSPITAL THAT EXPERIMENTS ON PEOPLE WHO ARE UNAWARE OF THE HOSPITAL'S ACTIVITY?
5. WHY DID YOU BECOME INVOLVED?
6. DO YOU ENJOY MODIFYING AND CONTROLLING PEOPLE THAT ARE UNAWARE OF EVIL PRACTICE?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ALL PARTIES	Pg. 9
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	Pg. 10-13
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	Pg 14-15
PETITION	Pg 16
CONCLUSION	Pg 17
INDEX TO THE APPENDIX	Pg 18
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	Pg 19

THIS IS NOT A GOVERNMENT PROJECT

LIST OF ALL PARTIES

THE CAPTION OF THE CASE IN THIS COURT CONTAINS THE NAMES OF ALL PARTIES TO THIS PETITION(EMILIA DINOLA, PETITIONER,)

VS EIGHT DEFENDANTS:

ROBERT JAMES STEWART, KEVIN MAIER, DORIS PAUL, ISOBELLE STEWART JOHNSON, WOMAN-SPACE: REGINA PODHORIN, MELISSA MC CULLOUGH. HELENE FULD CRISIS CENTER: DR. GOERING HAMPTON HOSPITAL: DR. DAVID SNYDER.

STATUTES, RULES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

DUE TO THE NATURE OF THIS CASE, "PSYCHOTRONICS" NO STATUTE HAS BEEN WRITTEN TO VERIFY EVIDENCE, EXCEPT THE PAGES OF THE BOOKS LISTED IN THIS WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND THE PHOTOS OF THE "DESTRUCTION" OF MY ANATOMY, ALSO HOLOGRAMS OF SOME OF THE PEOPLE INVOLVED.

THIS CASE IS A "PRECEDENT" SET BEFORE THE COURT.

ARTICLE I

ALL HUMAN BEINGS ARE BORN FREE AND EQUAL IN DIGNITY AND RIGHTS, THEY ARE ENDOWED WITH REASON AND CONSCIENCE AND SHOULD ACT TOWARDS ONE ANOTHER IN A SPIRIT OF BROTHERHOOD.

ARTICLE 2

EVERYONE IS ENTITLED TO ALL THE RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS SET FORTH IN

THIS DECLARATION, WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF ANY KIND SUCH AS RACE,COLOUR, SEX, LANGUAGE, RELIGION, POLITICAL OR OTHER STATUS.

A. THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE, HAVE NO RIGHT TO CONTROL MY FAMILY AND I WITH THE USE OF "PSYCHOTRONICS" OR ANYTHING OTHERWISE.

ARTICLE 3

EVERYONE HAS THE RIGHT TO LIFE, LIBERTY AND SECURITY OF PERSON.

A. MY FAMILY AND I HAVE BEEN DEPRIVED OF OUR CHOICE OF LIFE, WITH INVASION AND INTRUSION OF OUR ANATOMIES, MIND, LIFE AND HOME, TWENTY FOUR (24) HOURS DAILY WITHOUT STOPPING.

ARTICLE 4

NO ONE SHALL BE HELD IN SLAVERY OR SERVITUDE, SLAVERY AND THE SLAVE TRADE SHALL BE PROHIBITED IN ALL THEIR FORMS.

A. MY FAMILY AND I HAVE BEEN MESMERIZED, ROBOTIZED, PUPPETED AND PHYSICALLY DESTROYED, AND I HAVE BEEN PHYSICALLY DESTROYED FROM HEAD TO TOE, AND HAVE BEEN FOLLOWED CONSTANTLY. WORDS HAVE BEEN ACTUALLY PUT INTO THE MOUTHS OF MY FAMILY WITHOUT THEIR KNOWLEDGE.

ARTICLE 5

NO ONE SHALL BE SUBJECTED TO TORTURE OR TO CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT.

A. MY FAMILY AND I HAVE BEEN PHYSICALLY DESTROYED WITH EXPANSIONS, REDUCTIONS OF OUR ANATOMIES, MY HAIR BURNED, TEETH LOOSENED, BONES AND NERVES PULLED, FINGERS LASER CUT, PAIN INFLICTED BEYOND HUMAN ENDURANCE. TELEPHONE HARASSMENTS, TAPPED WORDS DUBBED INTO OUR CONVERSATIONS.

ARTICLE 6

EVERYONE HAS THE RIGHT TO RECOGNITION

//

EVERYWHERE AS A PERSON BEFORE TH LAW.

A. I HAVE BEEN DENIED AN INVESTIGATION A HEARING IN THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT OF NEW JERSEY, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD CIRCUIT, HELP FROM STATE AGENCIES, LAWYERS, POLICE, POLITICAL FIGURES AND ETC.

ARTICLE 8

EVERYONE HAS THE RIGHT TO AN EFFECTIVE REMEDY BY THE COMPETENT NATIONAL TRIBUNALS FOR ACTS VIOLATING THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS GRANTED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE LAW.

A. MY FAMILY HAVE BEEN MESMERIZED, ROBOTIZED, AND PUPPETED AND MANIPULATED.

ARTICLE 9

NO ONE SHALL BE SUBJECTED TO ARBITRARY ARREST, DETENTION OR EXILE.

A. I WAS PLACED IN LOCKED QUARTERS, IN HOSPITALS, HELENE FULD AND HAMPTON FOR NO REASON.

ARTICLE 12

NO ONE SHALL BE SUBJECTED TO ARBITRARY INTERFERENCE WITH HIS PRIVACY, FAMILY AND HOUSE OR CORRESPONDENCE, NOR TO ATTACKS UPON HIS HONOUR AND REPUTATION. EVERYONE HAS THE RIGHT TO THE PROTECTION OF THE LAW AGAINST SUCH INTERFERENCE OR ATTACK.

A. MY FAMILY AND I HAVE BEEN INVADED MENTALLY, PHYSICALLY, VERBALLY, OUR EFFECTS HAVE BEEN DESTROYED IN OUR HOMES TO INDUCE UNNECESSARY EXPENDITURES. NO PRIVACY PHYSICALLY, MENTALLY IN OUR HOMES OR WHERE WE TRAVEL.

ARTICLE 13

EVERY ONE HAS THE RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT AND RESIDENCE WITHIN THE BORDERS OF EACH STATE.

A. MY FAMILY AND I HAVE BEEN FOLLOWED IN OUR HOMES AND WHERE WE TRAVEL.

ARTICLE 18

EVERYONE HAS THE RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, CONSCIENCE, AND RELIGION, THIS RIGHT INCLUDES FREEDOM TO CHANGE HIS RELIGION OR BELIEF AND FREEDOM EITHER ALONE OR IN COMMUNITY WITH OTHERS AND IN PUBLIC OR PRIVATE TO MANIFEST HIS RELIGION OR BELIEF IN TEACHING, PRACTICING, WORSHIP AND OBSERVANCE.

A. MY FAMILY HAVE BEEN MESMERIZED, ROBOTIZED AND PUPPETED.

ARTICLE 19

EVERYONE HAS THE RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF OPINION AND EXPRESSION: THIS RIGHT INCLUDES FREEDOM TO HOLD OPINIONS WITHOUT INTERFERENCE AND TO SEEK, RECEIVE AND IMPART INFORMATION AND IDEAS THROUGH ANY MEDIA AND REGARDLESS OF FRONTIERS.

A. MY FAMILY HAVE BEEN PUPPETED, WITH WORDS INTO THEIR CONVERSATIONS, UNKNOWN TO THEM.

DEPRIVING THEM OF THEIR OWN CHOICE OF CONVERSATION.

ARTICLE 20

EVERY ONE HAS THE RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF PEACEFUL ASSEMBLY AND ASSOCIATION.

A. ROBERT JAMES STEWART TRIED TO ALIENATE ME FROM MY FAMILY BY WORDS DUBBED INTO OUR CONVERSATIONS, NOT BY MY FAMILY'S CHOICE OF WORDS. (PUPPETED)

ARTICLE 22

EVERYONE AS A MEMBER OF SOCIETY HAS THE RIGHT TO THE FREE DEVELOPMENT OF HIS PERSONALITY.

A. BECAUSE MY FAMILY WAS MESMERIZED, ROBOTIZED, PUPPETED, AND PHYSICALLY DESTROYED, HAD PERONSALITY CHANGES, NOT THEIR OWN.

ARTICLE 30

NOTHING IN THIS DECLARATION MAY BE INTERPETED AS IMPLYING FOR ANY STATE GROUP OR PERSON ANY RIGHT TO ENGAGE IN

ANY ACTIVITY OR TO PERFORM ANY ACT AIMED AT THE DESTRUCTION OF ANY OF THE RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS SET FORTH HEREIN.

A. MY FAMILY AND MY CHOICE OF FREEDOM OF OUR LIVES HAVE BEEN INVADED, INTRUDED UPON AND DENIED THE FREEDOM OF LIFE, AND OUR PERSONAL OWN SELF. OUR HOMES HAVE BEEN INVADED BY THESE "EVIL" DESTROYERS TO CONTROL.

CIVIL PRACTICE: 4:74-7

I WAS INVOLUNTARILY COMMITTED TO MENTAL WARDS, THE HELENE FULD HOSPITAL AND HAMPTON HOSPITAL WITHOUT REASON OR EXPLANATION. DR. GOERING TRIED TO "BRAINWASH" ME, AND DR. DAVID SNYDER USED UNNECESSARY DRUGS TO "CONTROL" WITHOUT REASON, DENYING ME MY FREEDOM OF MY LIFE. DR. GOERING'S LICENSE HAS ELASPED IN JUNE 1979.

STATEMENT OF THE SUBJECT

MY FAMILY AND I ARE DEPRIVED OF OUR RIGHT TO FREEDOM, LIBERTY, AND OUR INDIVIDUAL CHOICE OF OUR LIVES IN THIS "SUPPOSED" FREE SOCIETY. WE ARE ENTITLED TO THE PRIVACY OF OUR NORMAL ANATOMIES, MINDS, LIVES, HOMES AND EFFECTS. WITHOUT THE INTRUSION AND INVASION OF THESE "DESTRUCTIVE" IN-HUMANE DESTROYERS TO CONTROL. WE LIVE IN A FREE SOCIETY OF HUMAN RIGHTS THAT ARE EQUAL TO ALL. NO ONE SHOULD BE SUBJECTED TO TORTURE BY ANOTHER THROUGH ANY DEVICE OR MENTAL TRANSMISSION THAT DESTROYS, MENTALLY, PHYSICALLY, VERBALLY, THEIR HOMES AND EFFECTS. EACH INDIVIDUAL IS ENTITLED TO THEIR FREEDOM AND PERSON WITHOUT INVASION OF THEIR PERSON, LIVES, HOMES AND EFFECTS.

NO ONE HAS THE RIGHT TO CONTROL ANOTHER'S LIFE WITH DESTRUCTIVE IMPLEMENTS OF ANY

KIND, MENTAL OR OTHERWISE.

REFERENCES TO THE PETITIONER'S CASE.

THERE WAS A CASE OF HYPNOSIS AND PERSONALITY CHANGE, BUT IT WAS NEVER BROUGHT TO TRIAL.

THE CONTROL OF CANDY JONES.

1. HYPNOTISM - CASE STUDIES

2. JONES, CANDY

3. NIEBEL, LONG JOHN

BY U.S. CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCT I TITLE

BF 1126-834 154.7 0926 76-7490

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN U.S. AND CANADA

BY PLAYBOY PRESS, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

PRINTED U.S.A.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AND CATALOUGING IN

PUBLICATION DATA.

COPYRIGHT 1976 BY DONALD BAIN -1935

THE MAN WHO MESMERIZED HER WAS - GILBERT JENSEN.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

EMILIA DINOLA RESPECTFULLY PETITIONS

THIS COURT FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

REVIEW THE JUDGMENT AND OPINION OF THE

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE

THIRD CIRCUIT ENTERED ON OCTOBER 13, 1992,

DENIED A HEARING NOVEMBER 16, 1992,

MOTION FOR RE-HEARING DENIED NOVEMBER

25, 1992.

STAFF ATTORNEY LETTER DECEMBER 2, 1992,

FOR RE-HEARING FOR RECONSIDERATION AND

DENIED DECEMBER 16, 1992.

NO REASON NOR EXPLANATION WAS GIVEN FOR

A HEARING, DENIED.

CASE NUMBER 92-5567 COURT OF APPEALS

THIRD CIRCUIT. FOR "TORT BEYOND THE SCOPE

OF THE LAW"

THE PETITIONER ENTERED THIS COMPLAINT FOR THE PURPOSE OF JUSTICE, ORAL HEARING AND MONETARY COMPENSATION.

TO SET A "PRECEDENT" BEFORE THE COURT.

CONCLUSION:

FOR ALL THE ENCLOSED REASONS AND CIVIL RIGHTS INVOLVED, I PRAY THIS REQUEST BE GRANTED.

RESPECTFULLY

Emilia Dinola

EMILIA DINOLA, PRO SE
302 Westmoreland Drive
Trenton, New Jersey, 08618

Tele: 609-883-1961

State of N.J.
Signed before me on this 2nd day of January 1993.

ANGELINE C. MAGOWAN
NOTARY PUBLIC OF NEW JERSEY
My Commission Expires Mar. 30, 1995

INDEX TO THE APPENDIX

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF NEW JERSEY DISMISSED THIS CASE WITHOUT REASON OR ARGUMENT.

DOCKET - 92-03411

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT, DISMISSED THIS CASE WITHOUT REASON OR ARGUMENT

CASE # 92-5567

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

EMILTA DINOLA

Plaintiff Civ. No. 92-3411 (GEB)

v.

ROBERT JAMES STEWART, et al, ORDER

Defendants

The Court having, by Order dated August 24, 1992, directed plaintiff to file a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the Court's jurisdiction depends and plaintiff having responded with a statement received on August 31, 1992, wherein she attests: "I am a victim of Psychotronics and am being tortured by "Inhumane Physical Destruction". To support my complaint I have actual photos to be presented at time of hearing. and it appearing that the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over this matter: and goof and

sufficient cause existing.

It is this 14th day of September 1992.

ORDERED pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P 12(h)(3) that this matter be and is hereby DISMISSED for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel, returnable on September 21, 1992, be and is hereby DISMISSED ad moot: and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that defendants Stewart, Maier, Paul and Johnson's motion to dismiss the complaint, returnable on October 5, 1992, be and is hereby DISMISSED as moot: and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that defendant Estate of Honorable Frank Kingfield's motion to dismiss the complaint, re-

turnable on October 19, 1992, be and is

hereby DISMISSED as moot:

FILED

1

at 8:30 M
William T. Walsh
Clerk

ENTERED

on
THE DOCKET
on 9-14-92

WILLIAM T. WALSH, CLERK
By EHR
Deputy Clerk

GARRETT E. BROWN, JR. U.S.D.J.

AMENDED DPS- 66 NOVEMBER 13, 1992

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE

THIRD CIRCUIT CA NO. 92-5567

EMILIA DINOLA

vs.

ROBERT J. STEWART, ET AL.

(D.N.J. Civ. No. 92-03411)

Present: SLOVITAR, CHIEF JUDGE: HUTCHINSON
AND COHEN, CIRCUIT JUDGE.

SUBMITTED ARE:

(1) BY THE CLERK IS THE WITHIN APPEAL FROM
SUMMARY ACTION PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 10.6

OF THE INTERNAL OPERATING PROCEDURE:

(2) APPELANT'S RESPONSE:

(3) APPELLEES' RESPONDE: AND

(4) APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE

IN THE ABOVE-CAPTIONED CASE.

RESPECTFULLY,
SALLY MUROS/ LLB
CLERK

SM/LLS/DMG

ORDER

THE FOREGOING

THE ORDER OF THE DISTRICT COURT DISMISSING THE COMPLAINT IS SUMMARILY AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT

DV SLOVITAR
CHIEF JUDGE

DATED: NOVEMBER 25, 1992

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR

THE THIRD CIRCUIT

NO. 92-5567

EMILIA DINOLA, APPELLANT

V

ROBERT JAMES STEWART, ET ALS.

(NJ) (TRENTON) D.C. CIVIL NO. 92-034111

PRESENT: SLOVITER, CHIEF JUDGE,

HUTCHINSON AND COHEN, CIRCUIT JUDGE

MOTION BY APPELLANT PRO SE AS FOR RE-

HEARING FOR TORT BEYOND THE SCOPE OF

THE LAW, TREATED AS A MOTION FOR RE-

CONSIDERATION OF THE COURT'S 11/25/92

ORDER SUMMARILY AFFIRMING THE ORDER

OF THE DISTRICT COURT DISMISSING THE

COMPLAINT, WITH BRIEF AND APPENDIX IN

SUPPORT OF MOTION.

SENT FOR THE COURT'S INFORMATION IN A

COPY OF THE FOLLOWING:

COURT'S 11/25/92 ORDER.

STAFF ATTORNEY'S LETTER DATED 12/2/92 TO APPELLANT PRO SE, TREATING MOTION FOR RE-HEARING AS A MOTION FOR RE-CONSIDERATION.

EILEEN POWELL 597-3244

TWO COPIES EACH OF BRIEF & APPENDIX SENT TO COURT

ORDER

THE FOREGOING MOTION FOR YOUR RE-CONSIDERATION IS DENIED.

BY THE COURT

D V SLOVITAR
CIRCUIT JUDGE

DATED: NOVEMBER 16, 1992

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a correct copy of this Petition was mailed to: Melanie Griffin, 1860 Brunswick Pike, Lawrenceville, New Jersey, 08648, Gary Potters, One Gateway Center, Newark, New Jersey, 07102-5369; Rudolph Socey, Jr. 3131 Princeton Pike, Trenton, New Jersey, 08648 Yves C. Veenstra, Suite 401, Route 73 & Greentree Road, Marlton, New Jersey, 08900, attorneys for the Respondents, on this 12th day of April, 1993.

Emilia DiNola

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT WAS GIVEN
THE CASE HISTORY AND PROOFS
"FOR A TORT BEYOND THE SCOPE OF
THE LAW".
I HAVE PHOTOS TO BE VIEWED
BY THE COURT THAT HAVE NOT
BEEN SHOWN.